DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 205 628 UD 021 480

AUTHOR	Little, Judith Warren
TITLE	School Success and Staff Development: The Role of Staff Development in Urban Desegregated Schools. Executive Summary.
INSTITUTION	Center for Action Research, Inc., Boulder, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jan 81
CONTRACT	400-79-0049
NOTE	27p.; For a related document, see UD 021 478.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Environment; Educational Improvement; *Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *School Personnel; *Staff Development; *Teacher Improvement; *Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to examine the nature, role and impact of staff development in an urban desegregated school district. The study was a collaborative effort that involved arrangements with district personnel, participating schools, and community members. An attempt was made to determine the contribution made by staff development to school success in the areas of academic achievement, attendance, program completion, and community support. Schools for study were selected to represent various degrees of success in such areas and various degrees of staff development activity. Interviews were conducted with administrators and teachers, and observations were conducted in classrooms, staff development meetings, and the general school area. Staff development appeared to have the best prospects when a norm of collegiality and of continuous improvement existed in the school. Successful staff development programs were marked by community, evaluation, and collaboration between teachers and administrators. (Author/APM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED205628

SCHOOL SUCCESS AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT:

THE ROLE OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN URBAN DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Judith Warren Little

January 1981

Center for Action Research, Inc.
1125 Spruce Street
Boulder, Colorado

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Paula C. Hiatt
Center for Action Research
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The work upon which this final report is based was performed pursuant to Contract No. 400-79-0049 of the National Institute of Education. It does not, however, necessarily reflect the views of that agency.

UD021480

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE 1

III. GUIDANCE FROM PREVIOUS WORK 2

IV. METHODS 2

A. A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH 3

B. SITE SELECTION 4

C. DATA COLLECTION 4

D. DATA ANALYSIS 4

V. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS 6

A. THE SCHOOL AS WORKPLACE: CHARACTERISTICS CONDUCIVE TO INFLUENTIAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT 6
1. Expections for Shared Work: A Norm of Collegiality 12
2. Expectations for Analysis, Evaluation and Experimentation: A Norm of Continuous Improvement 12

B. CHARACTERISTICS OF INFLUENTIAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT 13

I. INTRODUCTION

This report describes collaborative research to examine the nature, role, and impact of staff development in an urban desegregated school district. We focus here on staff development as one of a potential array of activities aimed at improvement of educational practice and prospects for educational equity in an urban school system with substantial socioeconomic, racial, and cultural diversity--an urban school system under the additional and profound pressure of court-ordered desegregation.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

This study was conducted in a school district[1] serving the principal city of a major metropolitan area in a western state. The area served by the participating school district has an estimated population of approximately 516,000; although the city has become more homogeneous in the past ten years as middle-class families have moved to suburban communities, the city continues to represent substantial socioeconomic, racial, and cultural diversity. The city is roughly 69 percent white or Anglo, 19 percent Spanish-surnamed or Chicano, 10 percent Black or Negro, and 2 percent "other" (including a relatively large number of American Indian and Oriental families). To serve this population, the public school system maintains ninety-three elementary schools, eighteen junior high schools, and nine senior high schools, together with an array of well-established alternative school sites.

The single major influence on district schools in the last ten years has been court-ordered desegregation.

Although implementation of desegregation has proceeded relatively smoothly (i.e., the district has not faced some of the overt, visible, and sometimes violent difficulties encountered by other cities), school personnel report:

> We have not totally succeeded in creating the kinds of schools we would like to have; the potential envisioned has not been fully achieved. Continuing problems and concerns about school environment, educational practices, and interpersonal relations remain to be addressed (ESAA Plan, December 1978, Section 1. p. 2).

---

[1]All actual names of persons and places have been eliminated or replaced by pseudonyms in order to preserve assurances of anonymity.

To manage the requirements of desegregation, and to meet other, related demands of a large, urban district, the district has directly conducted or indirectly supported a range of staff development programs throughout the past ten years. In 1978, a Department of Staff Development was formed. That department has grounded its program on a mode of delivery that attempts to take deliberate and systematic account of the social organizational setting of the school. In addition to employing the usual range of delivery modes (workshops, preparation of materials, visiting speakers, and so forth, the department has sought to increase adoption of new practices by expanding the role of instruction committee representatives, by seeking staff development liaisons and by working to build teams in schools. In a brief document, "Instruction Committees as Educational Linkers," the Department of Staff Development registered its intent to cultivate instruction committees as groups within schools acting as principal agents of change.

III. GUIDANCE FROM PREVIOUS WORK

This study has been informed by two lines of previous inquiry. First, it continues a line of case study inquiry into the internal life of urban and desegregated schools. And second, it is grounded in the assumptions of organizational theory (specifically role theory applied to organizational settings) and in previous studies of organizational change in schools. The existing literature on staff development has been selectively reviewed from an organizational change perspective. (See attached reference list).

IV. METHODS

Existing theoretical development and empirical research offered little persuasive ground for the identification of critical variables and for formulating testable hypotheses. On these grounds, we proposed inquiry that was fundamentally ethnographic and which was aimed at: (1) the production of sufficiently detailed descriptive accounts to serve as the basis for theoretical speculation and practical reform, (2) formulation of characteristic dimensions of school setting and staff development that constitute a framework within which guiding questions may be placed and within which subsequent findings may be interpreted, and (3) the elaboration and refinement of a matrix of central questions to guide subsequent research and practice.

A. A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH

Throughout the course of this work, Center for Action Research staff have cultivated a set of collaborative arrangements with district personnel, with participating schools, and with others to whom this inquiry appeared relevant and from whom we could expect to draw insight and advice. Collaboration had several virtues.

First, it offered some assurance that the connection between theory and practice would be accommodated at every stage of the work, and not attempted only as an afterthought upon presentation of findings. In this respect, collaboration achieved the intersection of two aims: the advancement of knowledge and the improvement of practice.

Second, collaboration insured that the interests, questions, and curiosities that emerged from local experience were represented in the research design, along with the interests, questions, and curiosities that have been drawn from the theoretical and empirical literature.

Third, collaboration offered an opportunity for a reciprocal working relationship between researchers and practitioners in which both gained the opportunity for reflection and for unexpected insight into situational realities.

Thus, while we sought to minimize our instrusion into the time and resources of the district and to disrupt as little as possible the daily business of education in schools, we argued that both the practical utility and the overall quality of the research would be enhanced if Center staff could sustain collaborative work with school personnel.

On the evidence, it appears that the contribution that research makes to school improvement is increased to the degree that schools are full partners in the inquiry. In working collaboratively with schools, however, we faced certain inevitable trade-offs between expanded influence on the one hand and time and resources on the other. Collaboration extended the time required to design and complete intended work, and added a certain diffuseness at some stages by seeking to account for diverse interests and requirements. Still, it permitted greater depth and specificity ("phenomenological validity" in Deutscher's [1973] terms). We expect that the competing demands that we faced are not dissimilar to those faced by staff development teams.

B. SITE SELECTION

The basic underlying interest of this study revolved around the contribution made by staff development to the success enjoyed by schools in areas of academic achievement, attendance, program completion, and community support. The study design called for selection of schools that represented a range of circumstances, both with respect to greater or lesser "success" and with respect to greater or lesser involvement in staff development activity.

One elementary and one secondary school were selected as sites with "high success" and "high involvement" in formal programs of staff development; from these schools, we sought insight into staff development's contribution to school success. One elementary and one secondary school were chosen as "high success, low involvement" schools; from these schools we expected to learn what untapped contributors to success might be incorporated into future programs of staff development in the district, and to learn how teachers sustained quality instruction. Finally, one elementary and one secondary school were selected as "low success, high involvement" schools; in these schools, we hoped to learn what aspects of the work setting or of the staff development programs had limited the programs' influence on school success.

C. DATA COLLECTION

In a nineteen week period, interviews were conducted with fourteen members of the district's central administration, 105 teachers and fourteen administrators in six schools; observations were conducted in the classrooms of eighty teachers, in six staff development (inservice) meetings, and in the hallways, lunchrooms, faculty meetings, lounges, offices, and grounds of the six schools.

Interviews were semistructured, given direction and comparability by an inquiry matrix and discussion guide prepared in the first stages of the study. In elementary schools, interviews were sought with the building principal and all members of the faculty. In secondary schools, where interviewing each member of a large faculty was not feasible, we concentrated on the administrative team and a purposive sample of teachers.

D. DATA ANALYSIS

Throughout the analysis, we preserved a careful reliance on persons' talk --in interviews and in naturally occurring interaction--

as the ground for all interpretation and inference. The availability of and reliance on these records of actual talk constitutes one check on the limitations, or biases, introduced by researchers' own perspectives.

All taped interviews were thereby transcribed in verbatim transcripts. Relying on teachers' and administrators' recorded statements, we generated a set of summary descriptive statements (3190 in all), each reflecting a practice and a set of dyadic role relations (e.g., "we lend and borrow materials"). Summary statements were recorded for each respondent on index cards and assembled for each school in broad categories derived from the inquiry matrix.

These cards served as the basis for all subsequent description and analysis. References to original transcripts and field notes were made only to retrieve the actual quotation from which the summary statement was drawn, for purposes of illustration in the text.

To convert a large volume of recorded talk to a smaller number of summary statements, we relied upon four principles of selection. The first is derived from the analytic and theoretical framework offered by role theory (and specifically Jackson, 1966; Gross, Mason and McEachern, 1958; and Kjolseth, 1972). The remaining three are drawn from Pittenger, Hockett and Danehy, and their work in developing techniques for sociolinguistic microanalysis.

Applying these four principles, then, we constructed for each school, each respondent, and each nominal reference group (teachers, administrators, counselors), a finite set of descriptive statements.

These descriptions, in each of the six schools, yielded a set of practices by which teachers and administrators in that school defined their respective roles and characterized their approach to "learning on the job". The statements further characterized practices according to their relative frequency, the degree to which persons approved or disapproved their inclusion in the work, and their value along certain other dimensions (e.g., utility or "practicality"; reciprocity or "professionalism"). Traced across respondents and nominal role groups, they served as the basis for establishing how broadly or narrowly, firmly or tenuously established were certain practices, i.e., how central they were to persons' views of their work. Taken as classes of interaction, they showed the nature and boundaries of teachers' and administrators' roles repertoire. And finally, they were the basis for examining points of continuity or discontinuity between practices or role repertoires envisioned by staff development programs and those presently approved and enacted in the course of daily work in schools.

This first stage of analysis was summarized in a set of six case studies.[1] In a second stage of analysis, fifty-six propositions were formulated to hypothesize features of the school as a workplace, and their bearing on staff development. An addiitonal twelve propositions center on the design, conduct and influence of staff development programs.[2]

V. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The commonplace (and commonsense) view that persons learn by experience is hardly new. Precisely how and under what conditions persons gain competence and confidence in their work is less clear. Less certain, too, is the way in which the gains made by individuals bear upon the broader success of the organizations in which they work. In talking with teachers and administrators in six schools, we sought insight into the nature and extent of "learning on the job," and into the ways in which organized programs of staff development serve to extend knowledge, skill, and satisfaction.

Two discoveries emerge from interviews and conversations; each gives rise to a set of propositions intended to guide further quantitative study and the practical design of staff development programs.

A. THE SCHOOL AS WORKPLACE: CHARACTERISTICS CONDUCIVE TO INFLUENTIAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT

First, the school as a workplace proves extraordinarity powerful. Without denying differences in individuals' skills, interests, commitment, curiosity, or persistence, the prevailing pattern of interactions and interpretations in each building demonstrably creates certain possibilities and sets certain limits. Those aspects of work that appear most consequential are those that are least often studied, least visible in any clear or systematic way to teachers (though sometimes the subject of complaints), and least often addressed in programs of improvement. Most at issue here are the nature and extent of collegial relationships among teachers and between faculty and administrators, and the nature of the stance adopted toward present practice and new ideas. Teachers' vivid portrayals of the job show how routine work arrangements and daily encounters with other adults in schools strongly shape expectations for "being a

---

[1]The case studies form Appendix A to the full text of the final report, (*School Success and Staff Development: The Role of Staff Development in Urban Desegregated Schools*, Judith Warren Little, 1981).

[2]The propositions are developed in chapter two of the full report.

teacher." Their descriptions led us to characterize schools and groups within schools by their participation in norms for shared work (collegiality) and norms for the analysis and evaluation of practice (experimentation, or continuous improvement).

In their training and throughout their work, many teachers are taught that good teaching is self-evident, that good teaching can be mastered alone by a kind of trial and error accumulation of miscellaneous devices which at least get teachers through the day, and that teachers can get help (at the risk of their self-respect) by asking others. This vision of teaching as a lonesome enterprise is powerfully confirmed by teachers' daily experience in many schools. Persistent expectations about joint work by teachers place stringent limits both on collegiality and on experimentation, and therefore on the ability of schools to adapt to changing circumstances and changing student populations, and on the ability of teachers to improve their practice.

We are led from a focus on professional improvement as an individual enterprise to improvement as a particularly organizational phenomenon. Some schools sustain shared expectations (norms) both for extensive collegial work and for analysis and evaluation of and experimentation with their practices; continuous improvement is a shared undertaking in their schools, and these schools are the most adaptable and successful of the schools we studied.

From the large array of interactions which we observed and which could somehow be called "collegial" in character, four classes of interactions appear crucial. School improvement is most surely and thoroughly achieved when:

Teachers engage in frequent, continuous, and increasingly concrete and precise *talk* about teaching *practice* (as distinct from teacher characteristics and failings, the social lives of teachers, the foibles and failures of students and their families, and the unfortunate demands of society on the school). By such talk, teachers build up a shared language adequate to the complexity of teaching, capable of distinguishing one practice and its virtues from another, and capable of integrating large bodies of practice into distinct and sensible perspectives on the business of teaching. Other things being equal, the utility of collegial work and the rigor of experimentation with teaching is a direct function of the concreteness, precision, and coherence of the shared language.

Teachers and administrators frequently *observe* each other teaching, and provide each other with useful (if potentially frightening) evaluations of their teaching. Only such

observation and feedback can provide shared *referents* for the shared language of teaching, and both demand and provide the precision and concreteness which makes the talk about teaching useful.

Teachers and administrators *plan, design, research, evaluate, and prepare teaching materials together.* The most prescient observations remain academic ("just theory") without the machinery to act on them. By joint work on materials, teachers and administrators share the considerable burden of development required by long-term improvement, confirm their emerging understanding of their approach, and make rising standards for their work attainable by them and by their students.

Teachers and administrators *teach each other* the practice of teaching. In the most adaptable schools, most staff, at one time or another, on some topic or task, will be permitted and encouraged to play the role of instructor for others. In this way, the school makes maximum use of its own resources.

These four types of practices so clearly distinguish the more successful from the less successful schools, the more adaptable from the less adaptable schools, that we have termed them the "critical practices of adaptability."

Confining our attention to these four types of practices, other characteristics of interaction about teaching tend both to distinguish the schools we studied and to help us to understand the requirements of these practices and the tactics which help to establish and maintain them.

In successful and adaptable schools, all four practices occur frequently and in a variety of places: training sessions, faculty meetings, grade or department meetings, hallways, classrooms, and the teachers' lounge. Collegial experimentation is a way of life; it pervades the school. While time for joint work is always a problem, time is used very efficiently because all available times tend to be used.

In successful and adaptable schools, interaction about teaching is consciously and steadily focused on *practice,* on what teachers do, with what aims, in what situations, with what materials, and with what apparent results. The focus on practice makes the interactions more immediately useful and therefore more likely to be sustained. And crucially, a focus on *practices* as distinct from *teachers* helps to preserve self-respect and eliminate barriers to discussion; the *utility* of a practice is thus separated from the *competence* of a teacher.

In adaptable and successful schools, interactions about teaching tend to be *inclusive*; a large proportion of the faculty participates, is part of the group of innovators. Even where smaller groups explore new options for teaching, they are mindful of the consequences for other staff and prepare thoughtful strategies for including others or for preserving their good will (or at least neutrality).

In adaptable and successful schools, interaction about teaching is described as speaking specifically to the complexities of the classroom. The talk is *concrete*, "practical." This is not to say that it is not philosophical or theoretical, because teachers report that interactions which provide a broad perspective on teaching have been most helpful. It is, rather, to say that the philosophy or theory must always be brought to the ground of specific actions in the classroom.

Attainment of interaction which can tie theory to concrete practice is not instant; the cumulative development of a shared language of teaching becomes crucial here. The more powerful and fully developed the shared language, the greater the facility with which broad perspectives can be applied to specific practices in the classroom. Observation becomes critical, and a willingness to observe and be observed in a useful, critical fashion is not built instantly.

In successful and adaptable schools, interactions about teaching are seen as *reciprocal*, even when they involve persons of different status (principal versus teacher) or different function (staff development consultant versus teacher). In part, reciprocity means an equality of effort by the parties involved. In part, reciprocity means an equality of at least an exchange of benefits. In part, reciprocity means equal humility in the face of the complexity of the task, and of the limits of one s own understanding. But crucially, reciprocity means *deference*, a manner of acting and speaking which demonstrates an understanding that an evaluation of one's practices is very near to an evaluation of one's competence, and which demonstrates great care in distinguishing the two and focusing on the first.

In successful and adaptable schools, collegiality and experimentation are made *relevant to*, an integral part of, the occupation and career of teaching. Teacher evaluations, access to resources, release time and other perquisites are clearly tied to collegial participation in the improvement of practice.

The status of an actor, both ascribed, e.g., position, and achieved (a reputation as a master teacher) tends to limit the rights of the actor to *initiate* and to *participate* in collegial experimentation. In some schools, such rights are limited to principals, department chairs, and some influential teachers. In the more successful and adaptable schools, rights to initiate and participate are more widely distributed, rely less on formal position, and are variable by situation. The greenest teacher who just happens to have taken a course of interest to other faculty is more free to initiate, participate in, and even lead some collegial work *in that situation.*

At any given time, actors' technical skills and knowledge tend to limit their latitude to initiate, participate in, or lead collegial work. Particularly where a faculty has established a direction and developed an approach and a language, teachers who have not shared in the prior developments find the "ante" too high; however, these persons can and have been brought up to speed where specific arrangements are made to provide support and to find joy and virtue in steps which the older hands attained much earlier. On the whole, we are inclined to see technical skill more as a consequence of, rather than as a precondition for, collegial experimentation in this sense: in the absence of the other social characteristics of interaction, technical skill will not produce adaptability, but where the social requirements of adaptation are met, technical skill can be increased progressively.

Finally, in successful and adaptable schools, the staff have learned social or "role" skills. Playing teacher to students is different from playing teacher to a teacher. Daily interaction with students in a classroom is not preparation for providing a useful classroom observation for an older, more experienced, and higher status teacher.

The crucial matter of *deference*--the behavioral and linguistic distinction of practices from persons and their competence--particularly requires role-taking skill. The younger and less experienced teacher providing an observation and critique for an older, more experienced teacher may find a couple of items on which useful comments might be provided. If the younger teacher acts as one acts toward students, we might expect, at the very least, that the useful comments will not be heard by the older teacher. There is a very limited, deferential role of "consultant" which the younger teacher might play, by asking a question about the observed practice rather than making a statement about it.

Such role-taking is not a universal skill. Rather, it tends to be learned where it is defined and required as a condition of collegial work. And in general, the skill is teachable.

Systematic attention to the preceding characteristics and requirements of collegial experimentation both distinguish schools we observed and will, it appears, increase the chances for building an adaptable and successful school.

By virtue first of office and then of performance, principals are in a unique position to establish and maintain the important norms of collegiality and experimentation, and to promote and foster the critical practices of talk about practice, observation of practice, joint work on materials, and teaching each other about teaching. Other characteristics of principals and of the situation aside, our observations indicate that principals can promote those norms and practices primarily by:

Announcing and describing them, particularly at important occasions such as the first staff meeting at the beginning of a year, then frequently and on various occasions thereafter to confirm and specify the desired interactions among teachers. The principal must imagine the desired behavior, then describe it concretely as the principal's expectations for life in the school.

Modeling or enacting the desired behavior, by asking staff for evaluation of the principal's performance, by providing useful, concrete observations of classes, by seeking out teachers to talk about practice, by contributing to the preparation of materials, by giving time while asking for time.

By sanctioning the announced and modeled behavior, in the allocation of resources such as released time, in required or formal evaluations of teacher performance, by visible and public praise for collegial or experimental efforts, by tolerating and absorbing inevitable failures encountered in experimentation, and so on.

By defending the norms thus established from countermovements within the school and from impositions from outside the school, from parents, the district, and others. Courage is likely to be crucial to this defense. Equally important, and more malleable, is skill in *translation* and *reconciliation* which deflects some blows, softens others, and negates yet others by finding commonalities of interest and intent among presumably opposing demands.

It appears that these steps of announcing and describing desired practices, modeling them, sanctioning them, and defending them are all to a great extent learnable skills; attention to them will be of great assistance to principals. In sum, two norms appear critical to school success and bear in important ways on the role and influence of staff development.

1. Expectations for Shared Work: A Norm of Collegiality

These are expectations for teachers as colleagues. One of the principal ways in which teachers characterize the buildings in which they work is by whether the faculty is "close" and by whether teachers routinely "work" together." The variations on these themes are considerable. Expectations for shared discussion and shared work distinguish one building from another; some buildings are reportedly (and observable) more "collegial" than others. "Work together" is most usefully elaborated as an array of specific interactions by which teachers discuss, plan for, design, conduct, analyze, evaluate, and experiment with the business of teaching.

To the extent that school situations foster teachers' recourse to others' knowledge and experience, and to shared work and discussion, teachers are likely to favor some participation in staff development; to the extent that they foster a belief that there is nothing to learn from others or that each teacher must pursue his independent course, staff development will hold little appeal.

Staff development appears to have greatest prospects for influence where there is a prevailing norm of collegiality. In each of six schools, we looked to teachers' accounts of daily work and involvement in learning on the job to reveal the nature of norms of collegiality.

2. Expectations for Analysis, Evaluation, and Experimentation: A Norm of Continuous Improvement

These are expectations about the business of teaching. By the nature of the talk they hear, the advice they are given, the meetings the witness, and the appraisals they receive, teachers learn a stance toward classroom practice. They learn either to pursue the connections between teaching and learning with aggressive curiosity and healthy skepticism. or to take as self-evidently effective those tactics that appear to sustain some measure of interest, achievement, and decorum among a reasonably large number of students.

To the extent that teachers believe "learning on the job" to be the exclusive task of the beginning teacher, they are unlikely to view staff development as an integral part of work in schools, i.e. a feature of the work that bears equally on everybody. To the extent

that teachers view improvements in knowledge and practice as never ending, they may value staff development and place increasingly stringent and sophisticated demands on the nature and quality of assistance. Where analysis, evaluation, and experimentation are treated as tools of the profession, designed to make work better (and easier), and where such work is properly the work of the teacher, teachers can be expected to look to staff development to help provoke questions, organize analysis, generate evidence of progress, and design differences in approach.

The relative power of these competing views of practice is particularly at issue in desegregating schools, where persons are asked to recast their shared aims (e.g., by adding goals of equity to goals of academic achievement), to judge the adequacy of their classroom practices by new criteria (e.g., by effects on intergroup relations as well as by effects on cognitive understanding), and to do both of these while living in the fishbowl of a large-scale social experiment.

In sum, staff development appears to have greatest prospects for influence where there is a prevailing norm of analysis, evaluation, and experimentation--a norm that may be unsupported by persons' actual experiences in learning to manage new and unfamiliar circumstances and that (in teachers' eyes) calls for a stability and a security that are in short supply as schools integrate.

To this point, we have tried to describe and analyze characteristics of adaptable schools. For us, then the probable effectiveness of staff development is a function of its attention to those characteristics. Staff development will be more effective to the degree it accommodates, builds on, stimulates, and nourishes the norms of collegiality and experimentation and the critical practices of talk, observation, joint work on materials, and teaching each other to teach.

B. CHARACTERISTICS OF INFLUENTIAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Staff development programs prove differentially powerful in influencing teachers' expectations for student performance, their perspective on teaching and learning, or their actual classroom practice. Programs' influence in these substantive arenas appears tied in large degree to their relative success in accounting for, building on, or altering the prevailing work relationships in a school. We have concentrated on revealing those features of staff development that teachers and administrators credit with influence.

Staff development activities seen by teachers as most useful and influential are described as *collaborations* between staff development personnel and a school, not something which staff development does to

the school but something they do together, each playing a part.

Collaborative arrangements confirm that collegial experimentation is *relevant* to teaching as an occupation and as a career. Individual requirements and aims, district requirements and aims and realities of work at the building level are more readily reconciled and dealt with affirmatively when a partnership is negotiated.

Collaboration provides the opportunity to build the shared language of teaching not only among teachers in the school, but also among staff developers and teachers. Aims, approach, requirements, reciprocal expectations--all are made clearer. More substantial commitments from school staff are possible.

In collaborative work between staff developers and schools, necessary reciprocity may be established between staff developers with their "book learning" and teachers with their "experience." Particularly, by inviting a collaboration, staff developers are then able to *model* collegiality and experimentation, as one of several partners in a team. The crucial matter of *deference* can be displayed, practiced, and perfected.

Effective staff development activities foster *collective* participation of the staff in a school. Teachers are not seen as individuals who are drawn out, changed, and put back, but are seen as members of an organization, whose adoption of innovations depends on the characteristics of the organization, and whose knowledge as members of that organization can be turned to creating the conditions under which all staff in the school will progress as they work together. It is important that school staff attend training as groups, even more important that they *implement* as groups, strengthening their collegial and experimental practices even as they adopt a specific new practice.

Recognition of the importance of the school as a workplace and of the needs for collaboration and collective work among staff developers and school staffs has led the staff development department in the school district we observed to rely less on one-shot training sessions and to rely increasingly on more *frequent interactions of longer duration*, in order to support *progressive* attainment of skill and collegial work.

Attempting to provide assistance more frequently and over a longer duration has stretched the resources of that department. This resource problem has led them to seek ways to cultivate the norms and practices of adaptability in schools as a substitute for their own direct efforts in schools. To the degree that staff developers can refine strategies for creating "self-assesing" and adaptable schools, they can introduce schools to new options for teaching with greater assurance that the

schools will be able to make the most of those options using their internal resources.

In short, staff development becomes less a question of development of individual teachers and more a question of organizational change. By concentrating on the requirements and tactics of adaptability, both school staffs and staff developers can make the most of the considerable resources they do have for getting better at teaching.

The demonstrable power of schools to build and sustain expectations for teachers' work with others and teachers' view of classroom practice confirms our view of staff development as a matter of organizational change. By celebrating the place of *norms* of collegiality and experimentation in accounting for receptivity to staff development, we place the matter of receptivity to staff development squarely in an analysis of organizational setting: the school as workplace.

REFERENCES

ALLPORT, GORDON. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Cambridge, Massachusetts:
1954 Addison-Wesley.

ALSCHULER, ALFRED, SOLOMON ATKINS, R. BRUCE IRONS, RONALD McMULLEN, and NELLIE SANTIAGO-WOLPOW. "A Primer for Social Literacy Training:
1976 Liberating Approaches to the Discipline Problem." Distributed by the Social Literacy Project, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts. (Mimeographed.)

BARTH, F. "Introduction." In *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*, pp.
1969 9-38. Edited by F. Barth. Boston, Massachusetts: Little, Brown.

BERGER, J., E. COHEN, and M. ZELDITCH. "Status Conceptions and
1972 Social Interaction." *American Sociological Review* 37: 241-255.

BERMAN, PAUL and MILBREY WALLIN McLAUGHLIN. *Federal Programs*
1978 *Supporting Educational Change, Vol. VIII: Implementing and Sustaining Innovations*. Prepared under contract no. HEW-OS-73-216 with the US Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation. (May.)

BIDWELL, CHARLES E. "Students and Schools: Some Observations on
1970 Client Trust in Client-Serving Organizations." In *Organizations and Clients*, pp. 37-69. Edited by William R. Rosengren and Mark Lefton. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.

BINGHAM, RICHARD D. *The Adoption of Innovation by Local*
1976 *Government*. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, D. C. Heath and Company.

CICOUREL, AARON V. and JOHN I. KITSUSE. *The Educational Decision*
1963 *Makers*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.

CLEMENT, DOROTHY C., MARGARET EISENHART, and JOE R. HARDING. "The
1979 Veneer of Harmony: Social-Race Relations in a Southern Desegregated School." In *Desegregated Schools*, pp. 15-64. Edited by Ray C. Rist. New York: Academic Press.

CLEMENT, D. C., M. EISENHART, and J. R. WOOD. "School Desegregation
1976 and Educational Inequality: Trends in the Literature, 1960-1975." In *The Desegregation Literature: A Critical Appraisal*. National Institute of Education, US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

COHEN, E. 1975 "The Effects of Desegregation on Race Relations: Facts or Hypothesis." *Law and Contemporary Problems* 39(2): 271-299.

COHEN, E. 1973 "Modifying the Effects of Social Structure." *American Behavioral Scientist* 16(6).

COLLINS, THOMAS W. 1979 "From Courtrooms to Classrooms: Managing School Desegregation in a Deep South High School." In *Desegregated Schools*, pp. 89-114. Edited by Ray C. Rist. New York: Academic Press.

COOK, S. W. 1969 "Motives in a Conceptual Analysis of Attitude-Related Behavior." In *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*. Edited by W. J. Arnold and D. Levine. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska.

CRAIN, ROBERT L. 1976 "Why Academic Research Fails to be Useful." In *School Desegregation: Shadow and Substance*, pp. 31-45. Edited by Florence Levensohn and Benjamin D. Wright. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

CULVER, CARMEN M., ANN LIEBERMAN, and DAVID A. SHIMAN. 1973 "Working Together: The Peer Group Strategy." In *The Power to Change: Issues for the Innovative Educator*, pp. 73-98. Edited by Carmen M. Culver and Gary J. Hoban. New York: McGraw-Hill.

DAVIDSON, JAMES, et al. 1978 "Measuring and Explaining High School Interracial Climates." *Social Problems* 25:50-70.

DOYLE, WALTER and GERALD A. PONDER. 1977-78 "The Practicality Ethic in Teacher Decision Making." *Interchange* 8(3):1-12.

EDDY, E. 1975 "Educational Innovation and Desegregation: A Case Study of Symbolic Realignment." *Human Organization* 34(2): 163-172.

ELLIOTT, DELBERT S. and H. VOSS. 1974 *Delinquency and Dropout*. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Company.

ESTRADA, JOANN and SUSAN HEDLUND. 1980 "Teacher to Teacher Training at the Secondary Level: A Collaborative Approach to Staff Development." *Journal of Staff Development* 1(1):56 (May.)

FADER, DANIEL. 1971 *The Naked Children*. New York: Bantam Books.

FERMAN, SHARON, ed. 1978 *Teacher Centers: What Place in Education?* Chicago: Center for Policy Study, University of Chicago.

FUCHS, E. 1969 *Teachers Talk: Views from Inside City Schools.* Garden City, New Jersey: Doubleday.

FULLAN, MICHAEL and ALAN POMFRET. 1977 "Research on Curriculum and Instruction Implementation." *Review of Educational Research* 47(1):335-397.

GOOD, THOMAS L. and JERE E. BROPHY. 1978 *Looking in Classrooms.* New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

GOODLAD, JOHN I. 1975 *The Dynamics of Educational Change: Toward Responsive Schools.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

GOODLAD, JOHN I. 1970 "The Reconstruction of Teacher Education." *Teacher's College Record* 72:61-72. (September.)

GRIFFIN, GARY A. 1979 "Guidelines for the Evaluation of Staff Development Programs." In *Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives,* pp. 126-139. Edited by Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

GROSS, NEAL, JOSEPH B. GIACQUINTA, and MARILYN BERNSTEIN. 1971 *Implementing Organizational Innovations: A Sociological Analysis of Planned Educational Change.* New York: Basic Books.

GROSS, NEAL, WARD S. MASON, and ALEXANDER W. McEACHERN. 1958 *Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

HARGREAVES, DAVID H. 1967 *Social Relations in a Secondary School.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

HERRIOTT, ROBERT E. and NEAL GROSS, eds. 1979 *The Dynamics of Planned Educational Change.* Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

HIRSCHI, TRAVIS. 1969 *Causes of Delinquency.* Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

HOWARD, EUGENE R. and MONROE K. ROWLAND. 1969 *The School Based Development Team as a Means of Fostering Rational Change in Educational Institutions.* Fort Lauderdale, Florida: The International Learning Corporation.

HURN, CHRISTOPHER J. 1978 *The Limits and Possibilities of Schooling.* Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

HYMES, DELL. "Introduction." In *Functions of Languag. in the*
1972 *Classroom*, pp. xi-lvii. Edited by Courtney B. Cazden, Vera P. John, and Dell Hymes. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

JACKSON, JAY. "A Conceptual and Measurement Model for Norms and
1966 Roles." *Pacific Sociological Review* 9(1):35-47. (Spring.)

JENCKS, CHRISTOPHER. *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of*
1972 *Family and Schooling in America*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

KING, NICELMA J. *Staff Development Programs in Desegregated*
1980 *Settings*. Prepared for the National Institute of Education. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation.

KJOLSETH, ROLF. "Making Sense: Natural Language and Shared
1972 Knowledge in Understanding." In *Advances in the Sociology of Language II*, pp. 50-76. Edited by Joshua A. Fishman. The Hague: Mouton.

KREINBERG, NANCY. "The Equals Program: Helping Teachers to
1980 Become Researchers and Problem Solvers." *Journal of Staff Development* 1(1):19-30. (May.)

LEACOCK, ELEANOR BUSKE. *Teaching and Learning in City Schools*.
1969 New York: Basic Books.

LEITER, KENNETH C. W. "Ad-Hocing Practices in Kindergartens."
1976 In *Language Use and School Performance*. Edited by Aaron V. Cicourel, et al. New York: Academic Press.

LIEBERMAN, ANN. "The Power of the Principal: Research Findings."
1973 In *The Power to Change: Issues for the Innovative Educator*, pp. 35-47. Edited by Carmen M. Culver and Gary J. Hoban. New York: McGraw-Hill.

LIEBERMAN, ANN and LYNNE MILLER. "The Social Realities of
1979 Teaching." In *Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives*, pp. 54-68. Edited by Lieberman and Miller. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

LIEBERMAN, ANN and LYNNE MILLER, eds. *Staff Development: New*
1979 *Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives*. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

LITTLE, JUDITH WARREN. "We, They, and It: An Exploratory Study
1978 of the Use of Talk in the Social Organization of Work." Ph.D. dissertation. University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado.

LORTIE, DAVID. *School Teacher.* Chicago: University of Chicago
1975 Press.

MACDONALD, W. SCOTT. *Battle in the Classroom.* Scranton,
1971 Pennsylvania: Intext Educational Publishers.

MANN, DALE. "The Politics of Training Teachers in Schools."
1976 *Teachers College Record* 77:323-339. (February.)

MANN, DALE, MILBREY WALLIN McLAUGHLIN, MIRIAM BAER, PETER GREENWOOD, LAWRENCE McCLUSKY, LINDA PRISOFF, JOHN G. WIRT, and GAIL ZELLMAN.
1975 *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change,* Volume III. "The Process of Change. Appendix A: Innovations in Classroom Organization and Staff Development." Prepared for the US office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation.

MCGRATH, JOSEPH E. "A Multifacet Approach to Classification of
1968 Individual, Group, and Organization Concepts." In *People, Groups, and Organizations,* pp. 191-215. Edited by Bernard P. Indik and F. Kenneth Berrien. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

McLAUGHLIN, MILBREY WALLIN and PAUL BERMAN. "Retooling Staff
1977 Development in a Period of Retrenchment." *Educational Leadership* 35:191-194.

McLAUGHLIN, MILBREY WALLIN and DAVID D. MARSH. "Staff Development
1979 and School Change." In *Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives,* pp. 69-94. Edited by Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

METZ, MARY HAYWOOD. *Classrooms and Corridors: The Crisis of*
1978 *Authority in Desegregated Secondary Schools.* Berkeley: California: University of California Press.

MILLER, LYNNE. "The High School and Its Teachers: Implications
1980 for Staff Development." *Journal of Staff Development* 1(9):5-18. (May.)

MILLER, LYNNE and THOMAS E. WOLF. "Staff Development for School
1979 Change: Theory and Practice." In *Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives,* pp. 144-160. Edited by Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. *The Desegregation Literature:*
1976 *A Critical Appraisal.* Washington, DC: Desegregation Studies Staff, Educational Equity Group, National Institute of Education, US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. "Resegregation: A Second
1977 Generation School Desegregation Issue." A position paper prepared by the Desegregation Studies Unit. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

NEMSER, SHARON FEIMAN and KATHLEEN DEVANEY. "Further Reading
n.d. About the Advisor Role." An annotated bibliography. (Mimeographed.)

NOBLIT, GEORGE W. "Patience and Prudence in a Southern High
1979 School: Managing the Political Economy of Desegregated Education." In *Desegregated Schools*, pp. 65-88. Edited by Ray C. Rist. New York: Academic Press.

OGBU, J. U. *The Next Generation*. New York: Academic Press.
1974

PARSONS, T. "The School Class as a Social System: Some of its
1959 Functions in American Society." *Harvard Education Review* 29:297-318.

PETTIGREW, T. "The Racial Integration of Schools." In *Racial
1975 Discrimination in the United States*. Edited by T. Pettigrew. New York: Harper and Row.

POLK, KENNETH and WALTER S. SCHAFER, eds. *Schools and Delinquency*.
1972 Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

RAUH, PAULINE S. "Helping Teacher: A Model for Staff Development."
1979 In *Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives*, pp. 174-188. Edited by Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

RIFFEL, RODNEY, FRANCIS IANNI, MARGARET ORR, ELIZABETH REUSS-IANNI,
AUDREY SAVWOIR, and ANDREA SPARKS. "Research on Desegregation in
1976 School and Classroom Settings: an Annotated Bibliography from a Field Methods Perspective." In *The Desegregation Literature: A Critical Appraisal*. Washington, DC: Desegregation Studies Staff, Educational Equity Group, National Institute of Education, US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

RIST, RAY C. *The Invisible Children: School Integration in
1978 American Society*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

RIST, RAY. "Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The
1970 Self-Fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education." *Harvard Education Review* 40:411-451.

RIST, RAY C., ed. *Desegregated Schools: Appraisals of an*
1979 *American Experiment.* New York: Academic Press.

ROGERS, EVERETT M. *Diffusion of Innovations.* New York: Free
1962 Press of Glencoe.

ROSENBAUM, JAMES E. *Making Inequality: The Hidden Curriculum of*
1976 *High School Tracking.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

ROSENTHAL, ROBERT and LENORE JACOBSON. *Pygmalion in the Classroom.*
1968 New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

RUBIN, LOUIS, ed. *The In-Service Education of Teachers: Trends,*
1978 *Processes, Prescriptions.* Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

RUTTER, MICHAEL, BARBARA MAUGHAN, PETER MORTIMORE, JANET OUSTON, with ALAN SMITH. *Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and*
1979 *Their Effects on Children.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

ST. JOHN, NANCY. *School Desegregation: Outcomes for Children.*
1975 New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

SARASON, SEYMOUR B. *The Culture of the School and the Problem of*
1971 *Change.* Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.

SCHERER, JACQUELINE and EDWARD J. SLAWSKI. "Color, Class, and
1979 Social Control in an Urban Desegregated School." In *Desegregated Schools: Appraisals of an American Experiment,* pp. 117-154. Edited by Ray Rist. New York: Academic Press.

SCHIFFER, JUDITH. "A Framework for Staff Development." In *Staff*
1979 *Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives,* pp. 4-22. Edited by Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

SCHIFFER, JUDITH. *School Renewal Through Staff Development.* New
1980 York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

SCHOFIELD, J. W. "School Desegregation and Intergroup Relations."
1978 In *Social Psychology of Education.* Edited by D. Bar-Tal and L. Saxe. Washington, DC: Hemisphere Press.

SCHOFIELD, JANET WARD and H. ANDREW SAGAR. "The Social Context
1979 of Learning in an Interracial School." In *Desegregated Schools: Appraisals of an American Experiment,* pp. 155-199. Edited by Ray Rist. New York: Academic Press.

SELIGMAN, C., R. TUCKER, and W. LAMBERT. "The Effects of Speech
1972 Style and Other Attributes on Teachers' Attitudes Towards Pupils." *Language in Society* 1(1):131-142.

SLAVIN, ROBERT E. *Cooperative Learning* (Report No. 267). Published
1978 by the Center for Social Organization of Schools, supported in part as a research and development center by funds from the United States National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University.

SLAVIN, ROBERT E. "Effects of Biracial Learning Teams on
1979a Cross-Racial Friendships." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 71(3):381-387.

SLAVIN, ROBERT E. "Integrating the Desegregated Classroom: Actions
1979b Speak Louder than Words." *Educational Leadership* 36(5): 322-324.

SMITH, AL, ANTHONY DOWNS, and M. LEANNE LACHMAN. *Achieving
1973 Effective Desegregation.* Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath Company, for the Real Estate Research Corporation.

SULLIVAN, MERCER L. "Contacts Among Cultures: School Desegregation
1979 in a Polyethnic New York City High School." In *Desegregated Schools*, pp. 201-240. Edited by Ray C. Rist. New York: Academic Press.

TIKUNOFF, WILLIAM J., BEATRICE A. WARD, and GARY A. GRIFFIN.
1979 *Interactive Research and Development on Teaching.* San Francisco, California: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

TYE, KENNETH. "The Elementary School Principal: Key to Educational
1973 Change." In *The Power to Change: Issues for the Innovative Educator*, pp. 25-33. Edited by Carmen M. Culver and Gary J. Hoban. New York: McGraw-Hill.

TYE, KENNETH A. and JERROLD M. NOVOTNEY. *Schools In Transition:
1975 The Practitioner as Change Agent.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

WILLIAMS, RICHARD C. "A Political Perspective on Staff Development."
1979 In *Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives*, pp. 95-106. Edited by Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

WILLIAMS, RICHARD C., CHARLES C. WALL, W. MICHAEL MARTIN, and
ARTHUR BERCHIN. *Effecting Organizational Renewal in Schools:
1974 A Social Systems Perspective.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

WILLIAMS, TREVOR. "Teacher Prophecies and the Inheritance of
1976 Inequality." *Sociology of Education* 49:223-235.

WOLCOTT, HARRY F. *The Man in the Principal's Office: An Ethnography.*
1973 New York: Holt, Rinchart, and Winston.

WOLFF, HANS. "Intelligibility and Inter-Ethnic Attitudes."
Anthropological Linguistics 3(March).

YIN, ROBERT K., KAREN A. HEALD, and MARY E. VOGEL. *Tinkering with*
1977 *the System: Technological Innovations in State and Local Services.* Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, D.C. Heath and Company.

ZIGARMI, PATRICIA. "Teacher Centers: A Model for Teacher-Initiated
1979 Staff Development." In *Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives,* pp. 189-204. Edited by Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.